

REMARKS

Applicants have amended claims 1, 12, 37, and 44 as set forth above. Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the outstanding office action is respectfully requested.

The Office has rejected claims 1-7, 10, 11, 12-18, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,864,364 to Ohyama et al. (Ohyama) in view of US Patent No. 5,347,378 to Handschy et al. (Handschy), claims 8, 9, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama in view Handschy and further in view of US Patent No. 6,256,067 to Yamada (Yamada), and claims 37-50 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ohyama in view of US Patent No. 5,748,236 to Shibazaki (Shibazaki).

Ohyama, Handschy, Yamada, and Shibazaki, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest, “acquiring a first series of images of the first scene with one or more image acquisition systems, each of the image acquisition systems having an imaging sensor which has a set of color filters thereon and has two or more color channels, each of the channels having a different spectral sensitivity” as recited in claim 1, “one or more image acquisition systems each having an imaging sensor which has a set of color filters thereon and has two or more color channels, each of the channels having a different spectral sensitivity, each of the image acquisition devices acquiring a first series of images of the first scene” as recited in claim 12, “acquiring a first series of images of the first scene with one or more image acquisition systems, each of the image acquisition systems having an imaging sensor which has a set of color filters thereon and has two or more color channels, each of the channels having a different spectral sensitivity” as recited in claim 37, and “an image acquisition system having an imaging sensor which has a set of color filters thereon and has two or more color channels, each of the color channels having a different spectral sensitivity” as recited in claim 44.

Applicants note with great appreciation the Office’s indication that, “[I]f the ‘imaging device having two or more color channels’ claimed were clearly specified as an imaging sensor having a set of color filters thereon the Ohyama reference would be overcome since the image sensor of Ohyama is admittedly a monochromatic device. Accordingly,

Applicants have amended independent claims 1, 13, 37, and 44 in accordance with the Office's suggestion as set forth above and to overcome Ohyama. Like Ohyama, Handschy, Yamada, and Shibazaki, alone or in combination, also do not disclose or suggest the claimed invention. Therefore, in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the Office is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 12, 37, and 44. Since claims 2-11 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 1, claims 13-22 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 12, claims 38-43 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 37, and claims 45-50 depend from and contain the limitations of claim 44, they are distinguishable over the cited references and are patentable in the same manner as claims 1, 12, 37, and 44.

In view of all of the foregoing, Applicants submit that this case is in condition for allowance and such allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 20, 2006

/Gunnar G. Leinberg/
Gunnar G. Leinberg
Registration No. 35,584

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Clinton Square, P.O. Box 31051
Rochester, New York 14603-1051
Telephone: (585) 263-1014
Facsimile: (585) 263-1600